



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/778,475

02/07/2001

Lori P. Engle

55188USA9C.014

4701

32692

7590

11/06/2003

3M INNOVATIVE PROPERTIES COMPANY

PO BOX 33427

ST. PAUL, MN 55133-3427

EXAMINER

HESS, BRUCE H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1774

DATE MAILED: 11/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/778,475

Applicant(s)

Engle et al.

Examiner

Bruce Hess

Group Art Unit

1774

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address —

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 8-4-02 (Amendment)
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 30-42 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☒ Claim(s) 30-37 is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 38, 39, 41 and 42 is/are rejected.
- ☒ Claim(s) 40 is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement

Application Papers

- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☐ Interv w Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 1774

1. Claims 30-37 are allowed.
2. Claim 40 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
3. Claims 38, 39, 41 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the patent to Shaw/Klein et al. (U.S.P. 6,036,808) in view of either of the patents to Engle et al. (Wo 00/73082 and Wo 00/73083)

The teachings of Shaw/Klein et al. are discussed in paragraph 6 of paper No.12 Plastic supports are generically disclosed by Shaw/Klein et al. (see column 3, line 1 et seq.) The Engle et al patents teach the advantages of micro-embossing the same plastic supports to improve inkjet ink drying times, improve abrasion resistance after inkjet imaging and prevent visual defects such as ink beading or spreading. Consequently, it would have been an obvious expedient to one of ordinary skill in this art to micro-emboss the support of Shaw/Kein et al. in order to improve ink drying time and abrasion resistance after printing and prevent visual defects.

The patents to Shaw/Klein et al. and Engle et al. are already of record.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Bruce Hess at telephone number (703) 308-2402.



B. Hess/lap

November 3, 2003

BRUCE H. HESS
PRIMARY EXAMINER